

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 were acted upon in the aforesaid Office Action. Claims 1-10, 13-17, 21, 22, 25 and 26 have been canceled and new claims 27-29 have been added, leaving claims 11, 12, 18-20, 23, 24 and 27-29 in the application.

New claim 27 is essentially a combination of old claims 1+4+9+10. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for lack of antecedent basis for "the interaction". In new claim 27, "the" has been deleted in connection with "interaction". Old claims 1+4+9+10 were further rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting with respect to USP 6,669,728 and USP 6,682,568. Terminal Disclaimers are presented herewith and are believed to overcome the double patenting rejections. Claim 10 was not rejected on a prior art basis. The matter of old claim 10 has been incorporated into new claim 27. Accordingly, it is believed that new claim 27 is allowable and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 11 and 12 depend directly or ultimately from claim 27 and appear to be allowable, at least through dependency.

New claim 28 is essentially a combination of old claims 13+16+17. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. However, no specific deficiency was noted and it appears that this rejection may have been unintended. Claim 13 was further rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting, as in the case of claim 1 and others. It is believed that the Terminal Disclaimers submitted herewith cure this problem. Claim 17 was not rejected on a prior art basis and it appears that the matter

of old claim 17 now being in new claim 28 renders claim 28 allowable.

Claim 18 depended from claim 13 and was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for lack of antecedent basis relative to recitations of "the interaction" and "the shaft" which appeared in claim 18. Amended claim 18 includes the matter of old claim 13 (which has been canceled) and the antecedent deficiency which appeared in old claim 18 has been corrected. Claim 18 has further been rejected on the same double patenting ground as the claims previously discussed. As noted above, appropriate terminal disclaimers are submitted herewith. Claim 18 was not rejected on a basis of prior art and therefore appears to now be in condition for allowance.

Claim 19 depends upon claim 18, and claim 20 depends from claim 19. Claims 19 and 20 would appear to be allowable, at least through dependency.

New claim 29 is substantially a combination of old claims 13+16+21+22. Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 with respect to no antecedent basis for "the interaction". In new claim 29, "the" has been omitted from modifying "interaction". Claims 13, 16, 21 and 22 stand rejected on the aforementioned double patenting basis, believed to have been overcome by the previously referred to Terminal Disclaimers. Old claim 22 was not rejected on a prior art basis. It therefore appears that new claim 29, containing the matter of old claim 22, is now in allowable condition.

Claim 23, as amended, depends from new claim 29 and claim 24 depends from claim 23. It is believed, therefore, that claims 23 and 24 should be deemed allowable, at least through dependency.

In summary, it appears that claims 11, 12, 18-20, 23, 24 and 27-29 are in allowable condition, and allowance thereof is most respectfully requested.

In the event that any additional fees may be required in this matter, please charge the same to Deposit Account No. 16-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott R. Foster". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Scott" and last name "Foster" clearly distinguishable.

Scott R. Foster
Registration No. 20,570
Pandiscio & Pandiscio
470 Totten Pond Road
Waltham, MA 02451-1914
Tel. No. (781) 290-0060

EC2/HAYES1CON.AMD

HAYES-1 CON